

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

Figure 4 and Figure 5 have been amended to include proper electrical connections.  
Figure 3 and Figure 4 have been amended to include an AC converter block.  
Replacement sheets for the amended drawings are enclosed.

**REMARKS**

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed June 23, 2005. In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to and claims 1-12 were rejected. Reconsideration in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Drawings Objections**

Figures 4 and 5 were objected to for depicting incorrect electrical connections. The drawings were further objected to for not showing an AC converter as recited in claims 6, 8, 9, and 10. Appropriate drawing corrections have been made to Figures 4 and 5 to represent the electrical connections appropriately. Further, Figures 3 and 4 have been modified to include a block for AC converter. No new matter has been added. Replacement sheets are attached hereto as required under 37 CFR 1.121 (d). In view of the drawing amendments, Applicants respectfully request for withdrawal of drawing objections.

**Rejections in view of prior art**

Claims 1-3, 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) as being anticipated by Schutten et al. (hereinafter “Schutten”). Claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Steigerwald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,693,805, hereinafter “Steigerwald”). Claims 4, 5, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schutten and Steigerwald. Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schutten and Steigerwald.

**Uncertainty regarding Schutten citation**

Applicants note what appears to be some confusion regarding citation of the Schutten reference. In particular, the Examiner referred to Schutten and to certain parameters and features of circuits in the Schutten reference. The Examiner indicated that the Schutten reference was the cited reference “AR.” The AR designation is believed to refer to the designation made on the Information Disclosure Statement filed on

February 15, 2005. However, the AR reference is, in fact, an article by Laimer et al. Moreover, the nomenclature used by the Examiner does not appear to correspond to that used in the Laimer reference.

The Laimer reference itself cites several articles. One of those articles is an article by Mr. Schutten, and others including Mr. Steigerwald, both inventors of the present invention. It is believed that the Examiner intended to cite the Schutten article referenced in the Laimer article. Accordingly, the present Response is made with this understanding. In the event this is incorrect, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to clarify the rejection in a subsequent non-Final Office Action so that they can be given a fair opportunity to respond.

**The cited references are not invention by *another***

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) and 102 (e), and independent claims 4, 5, 9, and 10 and their dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutten and Steigerwald. In response to the Office Action, Applicants affirm that Robert Louis Steigerwald and Michael Joseph Schutten, the co-authors named in the Schutten reference, and co-inventors in the Steigerwald patent contributed any common subject matter to the present invention.

An affidavit of Robert Louis Steigerwald and Michael Joseph Schutten under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 has been prepared and is enclosed with this Response, declaring that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the Schutten reference and Steigerwald patent was derived from the co-inventors of the present application and is therefore not the invention by “another”.

Accordingly, the independent claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and the claims depending therefrom, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

**Summary**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/21/2005

29  
Patrick S. Yoder  
Reg. No. 37,479  
FLETCHER YODER  
P.O. Box 692289  
Houston, TX 77269-2289  
(281) 970-4545